

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested. Applicant has amended claims 23, 25, 26, 30 and 32, canceled claims 1-6, 9 and 12-22 Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 34-40 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration of this application is, consequently, earnestly solicited in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant thanks Examiner for examining claim 33 as best understood by the Examiner.

Claim 33 depends from independent claim 32. Claim 32 has been amended to properly depend from claim 30. Since claim 33 depends from amended claim 30 which recites the limitation of the retroreflective surface being an ARC display component. The claim 33 limitation of "said ARC display component" finds antecedent basis from claim 30. For these reasons, Applicant believes that that claim 33 overcomes the section 112 rejection and is allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi (US 2003/0137731). Examiner indicated in paragraph 9 of the communication that claims 23-31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 21 and 22 have been canceled. Claim 23 has been amended to include the limitation of base claim 21 and dependent claim 22. Claims 25, 26 and 30 were amended to properly depend from amended base claim 23. For these reasons, Applicant believes that amended base claim 23 and dependent claims 24-31 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103:


Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi. Claim 32 has been amended to depend from claim 30 which depends from amended base claim 21. Examiner indicated that claims 23-31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitation of base claim 21 and intervening claim 22. Claim 23 has been amended to overcome the objection.

Claim 32 depends from allowable claim 30 which depends from allowable base claim 23. Examiner alleges that it would be obvious to include the projection system in a HMPD. Even if it would have been obvious, Takahashi does not include all of the limitation recited in amended base claim 23 and intervening claim 30. Since claim 32 depends from allowable base claim 23, Applicant believes that amended claim 32 is allowable.

Applicant again thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 7, 8, 10, 11 and 34-40. In view of the foregoing considerations, it is respectfully urged that claims 23-33 be

allowed. Such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to contact the attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully Submitted;



Brian S. Steinberger
Registration No. 36,423
101 Brevard Avenue
Cocoa, Florida 32922
Telephone: (321) 633-5080

Date 10/19/05